Office - Supreme Court, U.S. FILED

DEC 23 1982

NO. 82-961

ALEXANDER L, STEVAS,

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1982

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA, EX REL., AURORA COUNTY, ET AL.,

Petitioner,

V.

RICHARD B. OLGILVIE AS TRUSTEE OF THE CHICAGO, MILWAUKEE, ST. PAUL AND PACIFIC RAILROAD COMPANY,

Respondent.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPENDIX

MARK V. MEIERHENRY ATTORNEY GENERAL State Capitol Pierre, South Dakota 57501-5090 Telephone (605) 773-3215

Counsel for Petitioner

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
MINUTE ORDER DATED DECEMBER 5, 1979	1
DECISION DATED DECEMBER 5, 1979	3
MINUTE ORDER DATED JANUARY 11, 1980	7

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

#### EASTERN DIVISION

Cause No. Title of Caus	
Brief State- ment of Motio	
	The rules of this court require counsel to furnish the names of all parties entitled to notice of the entry of an order and the names and addressed of their attorneys. Please do this immediately below (separate lists may be appended).
Names and Addresses of moving couns	el
Representing	
Names and Addresses of other counsel entitled to notice and names of par-	
ties they represent.	

Enter order No. 26B:

Reserve space below for notations by minute clerk

Trustee's motion for summary judgment on the complaint filed by the State of South Dakota on behalf of its political subdivisions, & Trustee's motion for summary judgment on his counterclaim is granted. The Trustee is ordered to serve & file proposed judgment order within 10 days to which plaintiff may file objections within 10 days thereinafter. (Decision attached)

Hand this memorandum to the Clerk. Unr. Dec.-21 Counsel will not rise to address the Court until motion has been called.

# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION

In the Matter of	) In Proceedings for the Reorganization of a
CHICAGO, MILWAUKEE ST. PAUL AND PACIFIC RAILROAD CO.,	) Railroad )
Debtor.	{
STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA, etc.,	
Plaintiff,	{
STANLEY E. G. HILLMAN, Trustee, etc.	NO. 77 B 8999
Defendant.	3

#### DECISION

Plaintiff has filed a complaint in this proceeding seeking relief from this court's Order No. 1, paragraph 10. We find and conclude that defendant is entitled to summary judgment on the complaint, and on his counterclaim.

The Trustee is indebted to various South Dakota counties for taxes due for 1977 and 1978 on the debtor's operating property within that state. The Trustee has admitted tax liabilities in specified amounts. However, the Trustee's counterclaim alleges that 29 of the plaintiff's counties are indebted to him for tax refunds pertaining to the years 1969 and 1970. Plaintiff has admitted the liability for the tax refunds, but has denied the specific amounts due.

Paragraph 4B of this court's Order No. 1 authorizes the Trustee, in his discretion, to pay taxes due upon the debtor's properties. Paragraph 10 of that order prohibits the set-off of any obligation to the debtor against any obligation owed by the debtor. Plaintiff alleges that the Trustee has abused his discretion in failing to pay these property taxes, the plaintiff seeks relief from paragraph 10 of Order No. 1 so that it may set-off the claims for property taxes against the tax refunds due the Trustee.

The affidavits submitted with the Trustee's motion for summary judgment demonstrate that the

Trustee has not abused his discretion in deferring payment of these property tax liabilities.

The affidavit of Richard Nugent states that the
Trustee has deferred paying more than
\$13,000,000 in local taxes since the filing of the
reorganization petition. This is well within the
Trustee's discretion exercised to meet the
debtor's continual operating needs for cash.

We must also deny plaintiff's request for relief from paragraph 10, Order No. 1. This court has twice followed the rule of <u>Baker v.</u>

<u>Gold Seal Liquors</u>, 417 U.S. 467 (1974), in this proceeding. (Orders No. 191, 196.) To accord plaintiff a modification of Order No. 1 for the benefit of the political subdivisions would effectively vacate paragraph 10 of the order and would impede the Trustee in collecting many of his claims. Allowance of a set-off, in effect, grants a preference to that creditor over others, and this we have consistently declined to do.

The affidavit of Richard Nugent sets forth the amounts due from plaintiff's subdivisions for overpayments made by the debtor in 1969 and 1970. Plaintiff has not contested the accuracy of those amounts in the manner required by F.R.C.P. 56, nor has it filed any response to the Trustee's motion for summary judgment, filed October 5, 1979.

AND DECREED that the Trustee's motion for summary judgment on the complaint filed by the State of South Dakota on behalf of its political sbudivisions, and the Trustee's motion for summary judgment on his counterclaim against those political sbudivisions, is granted. The Trustee shall serve and file a proposed judgment order within ten (10) days to which plaintiff may file objections within ten (10) days thereafter.

ENTER:

JUDGE, U.S. DISTRICT COURT

DATED: Dec. 5, 1979

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

#### EASTERN DIVISION

Title of Cause	In the Matter CHICAGO, MILWAUKEE, ST. PAUL & PACIFIC R. CO.
Brief State- ment of Motion	
	The rules of this court require counse to furnish the names of all parties entitled to notice of the entry of an order and the names and addressed of their attorneys. Please do this immediately below (separate lists may be appended)
Names and Addresses of moving counsel	
Representing	
Names and Addresses of other counsel entitled to	
notice and names of par- ties they represent.	

Reserve space below for notations by minute clerk

Motion of the State of South Dakota, on behalf of its political subdivisions, to reconsider this court's Order No.

263 is denied. Baker v. Gold Seal

Liquors, 417 U.S. 467 (1974) is not limited to unsecured claims (e.g. p.

473). Also, continual need for operating cash pending reorganization justifies this treatment of plaintiff's claims.

#### ENTER:

/s/ Thomas R. McMillen
JUDGE, U.S. District Court

Hand this memorandum to the Clerk.
Counsel will not rise to address the Court until
motion has been called.